UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,212	08/31/2001	Thomas M. Kurth	URE02 P-309	2406

277 7590 09/26/2006

PRICE HENEVELD COOPER DEWITT & LITTON, LLP
695 KENMOOR, S.E.
P O BOX 2567
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501

EXAMINER	
COONEY, JOHN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1711	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/944,212	KURTH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John m. Cooney	1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *8-7-06*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *36,37,41-56,60-62 and 76-82* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *36,37,41-56,60-62 and 76-82* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *0806*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8-7-06 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 36-37, 41-56, 60-62, and 76-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Croft (5,688,860).

Croft discloses polymer materials comprising the reaction product of isocyanates, isocyanate reactive materials, catalysts, plasticizers, extenders/crosslinkers, and other materials reading on the products as claimed as claimed by applicants (see column 10 line 60 – column 12 line 40, as well as, the entire document). Croft's disclosure sets forth materials and reactants as well as intermediates employed in the making of its products such that it is seen that esterification to the degree defined by the claims is

met by Croft's disclosure, and this recitation in the claims does not distinguish the claims over the teachings of Croft.

Croft differs from applicants' claims in that its oils and derivatives are not blown. However, GRANT et al. (see page 89) discloses blowing oils to be a well known treatment of oils for purposes of providing well studied oxidization effects to the oils which are blown. Based on the disclosure of GRANT et al. and applicants' own admissions, it is held that it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have blown the vegetable oils of Croft in the manner disclosed by GRANT et al. for the purpose of obtaining reactants which have been oxidized and are prone to faster drying/curing in order to arrive at the products of applicants' claims with the expectation of success in the absence of a showing of new or unexpected results.

When reviewing results, the following must be considered:

Result Must Compare to Closest Prior Art:

Where a definite comparative standard may be used, the comparison must relate to the prior art embodiment relied upon and not other prior art – *Blanchard v. Ooms,* 68 USPQ 314 – and must be with a disclosure identical (not similar) with that of said embodiment: *In re Tatincloux,* 108 USPQ 125.

Results Must be Unexpected:

Unexpected properties must be more significant than expected properties to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Nolan* 193 USPQ 641 CCPA 1977.

Obviousness does not require absolute predictability. *In re Miegel* 159 USPQ 716.

Since unexpected results are by definition unpredictable, evidence presented in comparative showings must be clear and convincing. *In re Lohr* 137 USPQ 548.

In determining patentability, the weight of the actual evidence of unobviousness presented must be balanced against the weight of obviousness of record. *In re Chupp,* 2 USPQ 2d 1437; *In re Murch* 175 USPQ 89; *In re Beattie, 24* USPQ 2d 1040.

Claims Must be Commensurate With Showings:

Evidence of superiority must pertain to the full extent of the subject matter being claimed. *In re Ackerman,* 170 USPQ 340; *In re Chupp,* 2 USPQ 2d 1437; *In re Murch* 175 USPQ 89; *Ex Parte A,* 17 USPQ 2d 1719; accordingly, it has been held that to overcome a reasonable case of prima facie obviousness a given claim must be commensurate in scope with any showing of unexpected results. *In re Greenfield,* 197 USPQ 227. Further, a limited showing of criticality is insufficient to support a broadly claimed range. *In re Lemin,* 161 USPQ 288. See also *In re Kulling,* 14 USPQ 2d 1056.

Applicants' have not persuasively demonstrated unexpected results for the combinations of their claims. Evidence must be attributed to the employment of blown oils rather than non-blown oils. Comparisons must be made with the prior art embodiment relied upon. Applicants must demonstrate their results to be clearly and

convincingly unexpected and more than mere optimizations of the knowledge in the art or more significant than being secondary in nature. As admitted by applicants, oxidation of vegetable oils brings about increases in –OH functionality as a result of the oxidation process, and there are numerous expected results, such as increased crosslinking density and altered reactivities, which would be attributable to the effects of blowing the oils. Accordingly, burden is upon applicants' to demonstrate that any showing of results is, in fact, new or unexpected. Additionally, applicants' showings must be commensurate in scope with the scope of the claims as they currently stand.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Cooney whose telephone number is 571-272-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck, can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOHN M. COONEY, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Group 1700